

REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 11, without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter; and amended claim 6 to incorporate subject matter recited in now-cancelled claim 7. Claims 6, 8-10, 12, and 13 are pending and under examination.

In the Office Action, the Office took the following actions:

- 1) rejected claims 1, 6-8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0140142 (“*Marples*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,602,784 (“*Piche*”);
- 2) rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Marples* and *Piche*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,393 (“*Ormazabal*”); and
- 3) rejected claims 5, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Marples* and *Piche*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0067487 (“*Freebairn*”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims for at least the reasons set forth below.

Rejection of Claims 1, 6-8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6, 8, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Marples* in view of *Piche*, because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The rejection of claims 1, 7, and 11 is moot due to their cancellation.

Marbles and *Piche*, taken either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed:

wherein Step B comprises:

B1. transmitting an Open Logical Channel signaling, by the internal network, to the trusted node;

B2. the trusted node informing the internal network of the selected media-stream receiving port; and

B3. the trusted node transmitting the Open Logical Channel signaling to the external network to establish a corresponding channel.

The Office acknowledges that *Marbles* fails to teach the above-quoted features. *See* Office Action, page 6, in connection with the rejection of claim 7. However, the Office applied *Piche*, and alleged that the description from col. 3, lines 44 to col.4, line 25 of *Piche* teaches these features. *See id.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Piche discloses that:

- (1) first, C1 sends a UDP packet U1 to server S1 via the interface F1:f1 of FW1, C2 sends a UDP packet U2 to server via the interface F2:f2 of FW2;
- (2) second, the S1 server tells C1 that F2:f2 are the external IP address and port to which the UDP data stream destined for C2 should be sent, and the S1 server tells C2 that F1:f1 are the external IP address and port from which C1 will send the UDP data stream;
- (3) third, C1 sends a data stream consisting of UDP packets destined for C2 from its internal port h1, firewall FW1 will send them from F1:f1 to F2:f2.

See Piche, col. 3, lines 44 to col.4, line 25. According to *Piche*, C1 and C2 send packet to S1 to notify S1 server the IP address and port of FW1 and FW2, C1 obtains the IP address and port of FW2 from the S1 server, and C2 obtains the IP address and port of FW1 from the S1 server before C1 communicates with C2. That is, in *Piche*, the S1 server first obtains the IP address and port information from C1 and C2. After that, the S1 server tells C1 the IP address and port

information of C2, and the S1 server tells the C2 the IP address and port information of C1.

Last, C1 and C2 establish communication. This is different from the recitations of claim 6 as recited in steps B1, B2, and B3.

Moreover, the S1 server of *Piche* obtains the IP address and port information of C2 by receiving the UDP packet from C2, and tells the IP address and port information of C2 to C1. *See Piche*, col. 3, lines 45 to 66. That is, the S1 server could not actively obtain the IP address and port information from C1 or C2, the S1 server could therefore only be passively notified by C1 or C2. In other words, the S1 server does not have any selecting function, and could not select IP address and port information. Thus, the S1 server of *Piche* cannot constitute the claimed feature of “the trusted node informing the internal network of the selected media-stream receiving port,” as recited in claim 6.

Moreover, before S1 server of *Piche* tells C1 the IP address and port information of C2, S1 server must first establish a communication channel with C2 by receiving UDP packet from C2. *See Piche*, col. 3, lines 54 to 66. This operation is different from the recitation of claim 6, where “the trusted node inform[s] the internal network of the selected media-stream receiving port; the trusted node transmit[s] the Open Logical Channel signaling to the external network to establish a corresponding channel.”

Therefore, the Office has not properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and claim 6. Thus, no reason has been clearly articulated as to why claim 6 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the prior art. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 6, and claim 6 is allowable. Claims 8, 10, and 12 depend from claim 6 and are allowable at least by virtue of their

dependence from claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection.

Regarding the Remaining Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action applied *Ormazabal* to reject dependent claims 3 and 4. Without conceding to the Office Action's assertions regarding *Ormazabal*, Applicant notes that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 is moot due to their cancellation.

In addition, the Office Action applied *Freebairn* to reject dependent claims 5, 9, and 13. Without conceding to the Office Action's assertions regarding *Freebairn*, Applicant first notes that the rejection of claim 5 is moot due to its cancellation. Moreover, *Freebairn* also fails to teach the above-discussed steps in claim 6, and therefore, claim 6 is patentable over *Marples* and *Piche* in view of *Freebairn*. Claims 9 and 13 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to certain assertions or requirements applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine

references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account no. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 6, 2011

By: /Gang Ye/
Gang (Gavin) Ye
Ltd. Rec. No. L0693
(571) 203-2764